

Application Serial No.: 10/586,900
Office Action dated: July 16, 2009
Response to Office Action dated: October 9, 2009

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the previous Sheets 1/1 with the enclosed Replacement Sheets 1/1.

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 16, 2009, the Examiner:

- objected to the title as not being sufficiently descriptive;
- objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 for failing to use adequate labeling of the black rectangular boxes (e.g., conventional graphical drawing elements to signify each circuit element);
 - objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 for failing to show every feature of the claimed invention, including an “elevators” and a “connector box or housing” as recited in claims 1 and 4;
 - objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 due to issues with the reference numerals, including:
 - the existence of two reference numerals 16 which are not described in the Specification, and
 - reference numeral 20 which has an unlabeled input;
 - objected to page 3, paragraph 17 of the Specification for improperly referencing the claims;
 - objected to page 5, paragraph 28 of the Specification for using a British-spelling of the word “behaviour”;
 - objected to the lack of disclosure in the Specification regarding reference numerals 16 and 17;
 - objected to the duplicative definition of reference numeral 19 as being both a “control” and a “contact”;
 - rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and
 - rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,056,088 to Gerstenkorn (“Gerstenkorn”).

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 were pending. Applicants hereby amend claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 to address formalities issues. Claims 1-8 are presented for re-consideration, without substantive amendment, in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the title as not being sufficiently descriptive. Applicants herein amend the title to describe the invention in greater detail. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the title.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 for failing to use adequate labeling of the black rectangular boxes. Applicants herewith submit Replacement Sheet 1/1 that provides text descriptions of the black box elements. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Drawings regarding the labeling of the black rectangular boxes.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 for failing to show every feature of the claimed invention, including an “elevator” and a “connector box or housing” as recited in claims 1 and 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection and direct Examiner’s attention to the fact that the claims recite “A method for stopping elevators” and “A system for implementation of” said method. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation of amended claim 7 regarding “the frequency converter [being] located in a connection box or in a housing of the at least one motor” is adequately shown by the Figure. In addition, Applicants believe that the terminology is so well understood in the field of endeavor and directed to peripheral features concerning the context of the invention that supplemental illustration is not necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s objection to the Drawings regarding the “elevator” and “connector box or housing” is without merit and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 due to the existence of two reference numerals 16, which are not described in the Specification. Applicants herein amend paragraphs [0030] and [0032] of the Specification to provide a description of the magnetizing current 16. The description is based upon the Figure and the listing of reference numeral designations that was present in the original English Translation of the Specification, but which was subsequently deleted to conform to U.S. practice

and procedure. Applicants also herein amend the Figure so that reference numeral 16 only points to the black box element, and not the contacts with the wires between inverter 13 and motor 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Drawings regarding reference numerals 16.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83 because reference numeral 20 which has an unlabeled input. Applicants herein amend the Figure to provide a power supply to the semiconductor 20. Applicants respectfully submit that at the time the present application was filed, one of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated that an input of the semiconductor 20 would be a power supply. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Drawings regarding reference numeral 20.

The Examiner objected to page 3, paragraph 17 of the Specification for improperly referencing the claims. Applicants herein amend paragraph [0018] of the Substitute Specification, which corresponds to paragraph [0017] from the Translation version of the Specification that the Examiner appears to be using, to remove the reference to the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to paragraph [0017] of the Specification.

The Examiner objected to page 5, paragraph 28 of the Specification for using a British-spelling of the word "behaviour". Applicants herein amend paragraph [0030] of the Substitute Specification, which corresponds to paragraph [0017] from the English Translation version of the Specification that the Examiner appears to be using, to address the spelling discrepancies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to paragraph [0028] of the Specification.

The Examiner objected to the lack of disclosure in the Specification regarding reference numerals 16 and 17. Applicants herein amend paragraphs

[0030] and [0032] of the Specification to provide a description of magnetizing current 16 and relay 17. The description is based upon the Figure and the listing of reference numeral designations that was present in the original English Translation of the Specification, but which was subsequently deleted to conform to U.S. practice and procedure. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Specification regarding reference numerals 16 and 17.

The Examiner objected to the duplicative definition of reference numeral 19 as being both a “control” and a “contact”. Applicants respectfully submit that there are no pending instances of contact 19 being referred to as “control” 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s objection is moot and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that claim 1’s recitation of “particularly” and the recitation of “at least one motor” are unclear. Applicants herein amend claim 1 to delete the “particularly” language, and paragraph [0006] of the Specification to provide support within the Detailed Description based upon the claims as originally filed.

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner asserts that claim 4’s recitation of “preferably” is unclear. Applicants herein amend claim 4 to delete the “preferably” language.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner asserts that claim 5 does not appear to be a limitation. Applicants herein amend claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner asserts that only one relay is discussed in the Specification. Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0029] of the Specification sets forth the possibility of one or more *relays*. Thus, claim 6’s recitation of “*at least one relay*” is already supported in the Specification.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner asserts that claim 7 does not appear to be discussed in the Specification. Applicants respectfully submit that paragraphs [0015] and [0024] of the Specification set forth sufficient disclosure regarding the “*connection box*” and the “*housing*” as recited in claim 7. Furthermore, Applicants

respectfully submit that these elements are well known in the art and would be understood by one of ordinary skill.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is improper, and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gerstenkorn. A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper unless a single prior art reference shows or discloses each and every claim recitation.

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites:

A method for stopping elevators-by using at least one AC motor driven by a static frequency converter, *in which a brake relay controls the brake of the motor so that de-energizing the brake relay will brake the motor*, the brake relay being connected with a safety switch in such a manner that *de-energizing the brake relay will reliably block the control impulses required for generating the driving motor field*. (emphasis added.)

Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose each and every recitation of amended claim 1. The Examiner asserts that, in Gerstenkorn, "AC motor 5 is driven by an inverter 56 and is braked by brake 6 based on a monitoring equipment 1 and switching brake circuit 3" (Office Action, p. 5, paragraph 8, ll. 3-4). However, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose that *a brake relay controls the brake of the motor so that de-energizing the brake relay will brake the motor* as recited by amended claim 1. Instead, Gerstenkorn is directed to an elevator safety circuit monitor and control for drive and brake that includes a motor-switching and brake-switching circuit 33 (Gerstenkorn, col. 2, ll. 18-20). However, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose that the motor-switching and brake-switching circuit 33 is a brake relay. Thus, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose *a brake relay controls the brake*, as recited in amended claim 1, in any way.

For instance, Gerstenkorn is directed to an elevator safety circuit monitor and control "which does not have the aforementioned disadvantages" (Gerstenkorn, col. 2, ll. 16-17). Gerstenkorn discloses that the aforementioned disadvantages include issues that arise "with electromechanical relays" (Gerstenkorn, col. 1, ll. 16). As a result, the claimed invention of Gerstenkorn is

provided “without electromechanical contactors or relays” (Gerstenkorn, claim 1, col. 9, ll. 45-46). Thus, Gerstenkorn specifically does not show or disclose an elevator safety circuit that includes a *brake relay*, as recited in amended claim 1, in any way.

Since Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose a *brake relay controls the brake*, Gerstenkorn cannot possibly show or disclose that *de-energizing the brake relay will brake the motor* as recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose that *de-energizing the brake relay will reliably block the control impulses required for generating the driving motor field* as recited in amended claim 1. Since, as discussed above, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose the *brake relay* or the *de-energizing of the brake relay*, Gerstenkorn cannot possibly show or disclose that *de-energizing the brake relay will reliably block the control impulses required for generating the driving motor field* as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, Gerstenkorn does not show or disclose each and every recitation of amended claim 1 of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gerstenkorn is improper for at least these reasons, and should be withdrawn.

Since claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and include additional recitations thereto, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gerstenkorn is improper for at least the same reasons, and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the current Amendment constitutes new matter. Support for the amendments may be found in, at least, page 7 of the originally filed English Translation of the Specification, which included a reference number list accompanying the Figure, the Figure, claims 1, 4 and 6, and paragraphs [0029]-[0032].

Having traversed each and every objection and rejection, Applicants respectfully request claims 1-8 be passed to issue.

Application Serial No.: 10/586,900
Office Action dated: July 16, 2009
Response to Office Action dated: October 9, 2009

Applicants believe that no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any fees are deemed necessary, please charge them to Deposit Account 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By Marina F. Cunningham/
Marina F. Cunningham
Registration No. 38,419
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 35301
McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
Tel: (860) 549-5290